

REMARKS

Request for Reconsideration

Applicant has carefully considered the matters raised by the Examiner in the outstanding Office Action but remains of the opinion that patentable subject matter is present. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Examiner's position based on the above amendments, Replacement Sheet 1 and the following remarks.

Claims Status

Claims 1, 4-8 are pending in this Application.

Claim 1 has been amended to add the limitations of claims 2 and 3. Claims 2 and 3 have been canceled.

All of the claims have been amended herein to place them into more conventional U.S. format and to address the Examiner's objections to the claims.

No new matter has been added by way of these amendments.

Drawing Objections

The drawings had been objected to because reference character 8 was not described in the Specification.

Attached is a Replacement Sheet wherein reference character 8 has been deleted from Figure 1.

Specification Objections

The Title of the Application had been objected to as not being descriptive.

In order to address this objection, the Title has been amended herein to be more descriptive.

The Abstract of the Disclosure had been objected to because the phrase "Figure 1" appeared in the Abstract. The Abstract has been amended herein to delete reference to Figure 1.

The Disclosure had been objected to because section headings were missing.

The Application has been amended herein to add section headings.

Additionally, it was noted that in paragraph 2 on page 1 reference was made to the precharacterising clause of claim 1. In order to place the Application into more conventional U.S. format, the actual wording of the "precharacterization clause" has been inserted into Paragraph 2.

Respectfully, no new matter has been added by way of these amendments.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 had been objected to because of a mis-numbering of elements in the claim.

Claim 1 has been amended herein to delete all of the claim numbers. Likewise, all of the claims have been amended herein to delete the numbering of the claims so as to place them into more conventional U.S. format.

Prior Art Rejection

The Examiner had put forward three prior art rejections. The prior art rejections are as follows:

- (1) Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 had been rejected as being anticipated by Okamoto;

(2) Claims 3, 6 and 7 had been rejected as being unpatentable over a combination of Okamoto and Onodera; and

(3) Claim 8 had been rejected as being unpatentable over a combination of Okamoto and Yost.

As noted above, the limitations of claim 2, wherein the rolling mounting means is formed by a multi-row angular ball bearing having an outer ring seated in a housing bore of the one housing part, and claim 3, wherein ball grooves of the angular ball bearing are formed on an outer circumference of the spindle nut, have been added to claim 1 (independent claim herein). It is respectfully submitted that rejections 1 and 3 are now moot because of the amendment made to claim 1. Furthermore, it is submitted that amended claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Okamoto and Onodera, rejection 2, above.

First, claim 1, as recited, has a hollow rotor which is mounted rotatably on the spindle nut of the screw mechanism.

Neither Okamoto nor Onodera teach a hollow rotor. The rotor in Okamoto, identified as 22 in Figure 1, is clearly

not hollow but is rather a disk shaped structure. Onodera has no rotor associated with its spindle mechanism.

Claim 1 requires a hollow rotor which is mounted on the spindle nut and, thus, Claim 1 clearly distinguishes over the cited references taken alone or in combination.

Second, claim 1, as amended, requires a multi-row angular ball bearing wherein the ball grooves of the angular ball bearing are formed on an outer circumference of the spindle nut. The advantage of the drive device according to the present invention can be seen in the fact that the radial and axial room can be reduced in a structure which uses a multi-row angular ball bearing.

Onodera had been cited to teach ball grooves of the angular ball bearing being formed on the outer circumference of the spindle nut, however these are not multi-row angular ball bearings.

Neither Okamoto nor Onodera teach a multi-row angular ball bearing wherein the ball grooves of the angular ball bearing are formed on an outer circumference of the spindle nut.

Claim 1 requires a multi-row angular ball bearing wherein the ball grooves of the angular ball bearing are formed on an outer circumference of the spindle nut and, thus, Claim 1 clearly distinguishes over the teachings of Okamoto and Onodera, taken alone or in combination.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the Application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Should any fees or extensions of time be necessary in order to maintain this Application in pending condition, appropriate requests are hereby made and authorization is given to debit account #02-2275.

Respectfully submitted,

LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP

By:



Donald C. Lucas, Reg. # 31,275
(Attorney for Applicant)
475 Park Avenue South
New York, New York 10016
Tel. # (212) 661-8000

DCL/DMCK/ns

Attached: One Replacement Sheet of Figs. 1, 2 and 3.